

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Complementary and Alternative Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JOCAMR_98393
Title of the Manuscript:	Preclinical in vivo acute toxicity testing of hyrdoethanolic extracts of Ficus thiningii Blume (Moraceae) on Wistar rat models
Type of the Article	Original research article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljocamr.com/index.php/JOCAMR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Yes Yes yes yes results were not interpreted properly. Error in tabulated values. In most of the section, reference was not provided	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Good	
Optional/General comments	Introduction was good Materials and methods was too much elaborated but not cited with proper reference. Figure number can be reduced by combining figures of similar data. (Eg: fig 3 and 4) Error in data (table 2, 3) Efforts were made to calculate the results but they were not effectively discussed.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	V. N .Meena Devi
Department, University & Country	Noorul Islam Centre for Higher Education, India